

REMARKS

The Applicant has filed the present Response in reply to the outstanding Official Action of February 17, 2004, and the Applicant believes the Response to be fully responsive to the Official Action for reasons set forth below in greater detail.

At the onset, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 33-47 are allowed and that Claims 18, 20, and 27-30 have allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since the Applicant believes that all of the claims are allowable over the cited prior art based upon the following analysis, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the present application in light of the present response.

Applicant would like to note that Claims 1 and 17 have been amended herewith. Specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to include a step for selecting a specific video display apparatus out of said plurality of video display apparatus is selected as a master display apparatus and selecting and the slave display apparatuses from the other of said plurality of display apparatuses. In addition, the types of video information that are included within the identification signal are now specifically claimed. Claim 17 has been correspondingly amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments. For example, at page 14, line 1-8, the specification describes an user interface section having multiple setting switches for activating a video display apparatus as a master apparatus and the other display apparatus is activated as the slave apparatuses. Furthermore, at page 18, lines 5-13, is a list of display information that is detected, discriminated and matched with identification signals.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-17, 21-26, and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-8-88820 in view of Yee. et al. United States Patent 6,122,000 (hereinafter “Yee”).

The Examiner asserted that JP-8-88820 discloses the claimed master-slave video display system. JP-8-88820 discloses a master video display apparatus and a plurality of display apparatuses. It appears that the master video display apparatus sends control information to the plurality of slave apparatuses. However, as noted by the Examiner the reference includes a detector/id unit in all of the apparatuses *which detects video images*. In stark contrast only the selected master display apparatus detects videos images in the present invention. The Examiner cites Yee as teaching synchronization of a multi-display stereoscopic system by synchronizing the master display system with the slaves, wherein the output of the master controls the slave.

We respectfully disagree with the Examiner and traverse the rejection based upon at least the following analysis and in view of the above-noted claim amendments.

First, the claimed invention, as amended, has an interface means for allowing the user to select any one of a plurality of display apparatuses as the master apparatus. (In claim 1, a corresponding method step for selecting the master apparatus.) The cited references fail to teach this feature. The references solely teach a fixed predetermined master apparatus that cannot be changed. In this regard, the present invention can have multiple display apparatuses with detector/id units but only the selected master apparatus uses the detector/id unit and the slave apparatuses do not use these detector/id units. The hypothetically combined references fail to teach or suggest this feature.

Furthermore, the references do not teach or suggest reading out display characteristics stored in the slave apparatus in *correspondence* to the *identification signals received from the master apparatus*. Yee teaches that a slave has a synchronization system to manipulate the video timing and the left/right channel display responsive to the master's synchronization output. The result is to automatically cause the video timing and the left/right display in the second graphics pipeline to proceed substantially synchronously with the video timing and display of the first (master) display. In Yee, the slave display apparatuses do not read out from memory video display characteristics corresponding to any identification signals from the master apparatus. Moreover, Yee assumes synchronism of the plurality of display apparatuses, and in particular assumes synchronism of the start of the vertical scanning. The present invention does not need this assumption.

In addition, the references fail to teach that the identification signals include corresponding signals regarding a frequency dividing ratio, a timing of writing into a video memory, a timing of reading from the video memory, a horizontal display width and a vertical display width at the moment of making a display, a horizontal synchronization frequency and a vertical synchronizing frequency of the input signal, polarity information of the vertical and horizontal synchronization signal, and a classification of the interlaced scanning and non-interlaced scanning.

Specifically, in JP8-8820 the master apparatus transmits a control signal including position and location information for making a screen display for each unit. The reference is not capable of synchronizing the master and slave apparatuses during a change in video characteristics such a frequency and polarity of the horizontal and vertical synchronizing components. See page 3, line 20-page 4, line 3.

Accordingly, the cited references neither taken alone or in any combination thereof teach nor suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

By way for example, the Examiner cited Takasu et al, which discloses a system, which based upon the detected input video signals frequency and polarity, determines the appropriate data for displaying the received input. This reference does not remove all of the above-identified deficiencies.

Therefore, the claims are patentably distinct from the cited references.

Lastly, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 and 13 because of minor informalities. Specifically, with regards to Claim 1, the Examiner objected to the use of “displays said video identification signal, because the specification describes displaying the video signal. Claim 1 was amended according to recite, “displays said video signal”. Claim 13 has also been amended to recite, “as claimed in claim 3”.

In the interest of brevity, Applicant has addressed only so much of the rejection(s) as is considered necessary to demonstrate the patentability of the claim(s). Applicant's failure to address any part of the rejection should not be construed as acquiescence in the propriety of such portions not addressed (including, but not limited to, the existence of facts alleged to be established by Official Notice). Applicant maintains that the claims are patentable for reasons other than these specifically discussed, supra.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of independent Claims 1 and 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw rejections of dependent Claims 2-16, 21-26 and 31-32 based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent Claims 1 and 17.

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth Weinfeld

Registration No: 50,929

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343
SW:lf